

By Mr. McKEOUGH:

H. R. 2971. A bill for the relief of Maude Sykes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2972. A bill granting a pension to Emma Hellwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUMLEY:

H. R. 2973. A bill for the relief of George O. Hanford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 2974. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 2975. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Pasko and Ksavery Frances Pasko (nee Fyalowna); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2976. A bill for the relief of Alois Hlad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2977. A bill for the relief of John Boska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2978. A bill for the relief of Merle E. Rudy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2979. A bill granting a pension to William B. Ludlow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2980. A bill for the relief of National Heating Co., Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 2981. A bill for the relief of Walter Ream Lennox; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2982. A bill granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims arising out of the acquisition by the United States of seven Austrian merchant vessels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

167. By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Petition of employees of the Boston Navy Yard, setting forth their complaint about being required to work overtime without any additional compensation; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

168. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N. Y., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

169. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of California Mission Trails Association, Los Angeles, Calif., relating to Federal assistance to the State of California in building roads for national-defense purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

170. Also, petition of Water Project Authority of the State of California, urging that the central water project of California be declared a national-defense measure and that an appropriation of \$50,000,000 be made for the fiscal year of 1942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

171. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of President Matthew Campbell and members of Westinghouse Industrial Union, Local No. 202, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, of Springfield, Mass., urging settlement of all labor disputes by peaceful negotiation in the present emergency, pledging support of the President's program to aid the Allies and co-operation to fullest extent with the United States Government to insure speedy and orderly production of defense weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

172. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the City Council of Tacoma, Wash.,

declaring that the removal of tax exemption on municipal bonds will result in increase of interest rates, add to difficulties of municipal financing, and increase taxpayers' costs of city government; pointing out that such removal of tax exemption would jeopardize investments of trusts, insurance companies, and fraternal orders; asserting that such a removal would, in effect, be a tax by one government upon another; therefore, asserting that no such exemption of income tax as to municipal securities should be ordained through legislation by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

173. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of residents of Schenectady County, N. Y., endorsing aid to Great Britain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

174. By Mr. HART: Petition of 38 residents of Hudson County, N. J., protesting against any measures that will take the United States into the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

175. By Mr. HOUSTON: Resolution of the Kansas State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to preserve and protect our American system of government in the enactment of defense legislation, particularly H. R. 1776, commonly known as the lease-lend bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

176. By Mrs. NORTON: Senate concurrent resolution of the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the United States Senate and House of Representatives not to ratify any treaty with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

177. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Automobile Workers of America, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Government contracts and labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. Also, petition of the Bergen County Chamber of Commerce, Hackensack, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

179. Also, petition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national legislative program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

180. Also, petition of the Ohio Department, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, Columbus, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1941

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, who alone art worthy to receive honor and power, for Thou didst create all things and because of Thy will they are and were created: We thank Thee that Thou art our God; and, as we move in the world of men, help us to be masters of ourselves, that we may become the servants of others. Quicken in us the spirit of courage, and grant that we may go forth with hopeful minds to meet the duties and conditions of this day, whatever they may be.

Bless Thou our homes, our families, friends, and neighbors, and all who wish us well. Restrain the purpose of any who may wish to do us harm, and let the

spirit of kindness supplant all enmity among men everywhere. In joy and in sorrow, in victory or defeat, in all times and occasions be Thou our confidence and strength, O Blessed Christ, for with Thy love Thou hast redeemed men of every kindred, tongue, and nation, and we beseech Thee, to raise us up that we may ever live with Thee, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit art one God, world without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 29, 1941, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of JOHN E. MILLER, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Arkansas, vice Heartsill Ragon, deceased, and sundry other nominations, and also a legislative matter, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) making an additional appropriation for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1437. An act authorizing appropriations for additional shipbuilding and ordnance manufacturing facilities and equipment for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code by extending the time for certification of national-defense facilities and contracts for amortization purposes.

REPORT ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 26 (a) of an act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America.

and providing compensation therefor, approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1941.

[Enclosure: Report concerning Retirement and Disability Fund, Foreign Service.]

MATTIE E. BAUMGARTEN—ERVINE J. STENSON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two letters from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation for the relief of Mattie E. Baumgarten, and also for the relief of Ervine J. Stenson, formerly senior clerk and special disbursing agent at the Southern Navajo Indian Agency, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company for the full year 1940, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring):

Whereas the Legislature of the State of South Dakota recognizes that our agricultural problem is our greatest problem, believing that only as farmers prosper can industry and labor prosper, and pledges its support to a national program of farm legislation which will produce parity price and income or cost of production for that part of our farm production required for domestic consumption, and

Whereas we recognize that the American farmer is entitled to the American market for his products to the full extent of his ability to supply that market on a cost-of-production basis, but the stubborn fact remains that the sum total of agricultural legislation up to the present time has brought neither parity prices nor parity income to our agriculture. And now we are menaced by a new danger—another world war—which seems destined for a long period of time to close foreign outlets for our surplus agricultural products. We are confronted with a situation which means higher prices for farm machinery of production and farm supplies and lower prices for basic agricultural products, and

Whereas we must honestly face the fact that farming is a business with inescapable production costs. Prices of agricultural products must bear relationship to such costs. Farmers do not possess the devices of highly organized capitalistic business whereby prices may be fixed on the basis of cost plus. Farmers must have the aid of the Federal Government to achieve their necessary parity or cost-of-production goal: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State Legislature of the State of South Dakota now assembled, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation that will provide the essential elements of cost of production or parity. Also, to provide for continued research for new outlets for farm products; to provide incentive payments to develop new production or expanded production of products which may be used in industry, and administer all farm programs, including benefit payments, so as to favor the family-sized farm unit: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the United States Secretary of Agriculture, and to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 28d day of January, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such tax

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress just recently adjourned increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon, making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon, despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a sales tax on gasoline averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1940 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of \$1,725,000, which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to a 10 percent retail sales tax on such product, which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type, which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural or producing pursuits; and

Whereas such tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and the administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should not increase such Federal gasoline tax or consider any increase in such tax, and should discontinue the same at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon its expiration, and should thus leave this field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various State highway systems; be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby, urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing any suggested increase in the Federal gasoline tax or the reenactment

or continuance of said Federal gasoline tax; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 11th day of January 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 2

Concurrent resolution commending the work of the Dies committee of the House of Representatives of the United States and the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in their respective efforts to expose and suppress subversive activities of individuals and groups within the United States

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That the Dies committee of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Federal Bureau of Investigation be highly commended for the splendid and effective work each is doing in investigating, exposing, and suppressing subversive and sabotage activities of individuals and groups within the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Congress give every possible aid and support to said committee and Bureau and urge that the Dies investigating committee be continued, to the end that all activities tending to hinder national defense and to endanger the security of the people of the United States and its possessions may be suppressed at the earliest possible moment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of state to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Members of Congress from this State.

Dated at Pierre, S. Dak., this 11th day of January 1941.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and incorporation in the RECORD a concurrent resolution adopted by the New Jersey State Legislature with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution

Concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate and House of Representatives not to ratify any treaty with the Dominion of Canada or pass any legislation which may provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, on February 12, 1940, passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the United States Senate not to ratify a treaty with the Dominion of Canada for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway; and

Whereas it appears that the present Congress of the United States will be called upon to approve or authorize the construction of the seaway: Be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring), That this legislature reaffirm its position in

opposition to the proposed St. Lawrence seaway because of its economic impracticability, its entire lack of advantage as a defense measure, and its detriment to business in the State of New Jersey; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and particularly the Senators and Representatives elected from the State of New Jersey, be memorialized and requested to not ratify any treaty for the proposed St. Lawrence seaway or to approve or authorize the construction thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the State of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AID TO NATIONS RESISTING AGGRESSION— LEND-LEASE BILL

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the American Coalition at its annual meeting in Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1941, which, I believe, expresses the thought of a great many of our people.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the American Coalition at its annual meeting in Washington, D. C., January 27, 1941

H. R. 1776

Whereas the Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8, subsection 12, provides that the Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years"; and

Whereas H. R. 1776 authorizes the appropriation without the limitation of time of all the moneys of the people of the United States deposited in the Treasury not otherwise allocated by Congress for expenditure by the President in his discretion in the national defense; and

Whereas the dictatorial powers conferred upon the President by H. R. 1776 place in the hands of one man authority to lend or give away any defense article, including military or naval equipment of all kinds, to any power and give the President authority to commit every act of war except the actual sending of troops and ships of war into battle; and

Whereas these dictatorial powers conferred upon the President violate the spirit of the reservation of war powers to Congress, as set forth in article I, section 8, subsection 11, of the Constitution of the United States, and in general tend to subvert the whole basic philosophy of our fundamental law; and

Whereas these powers, if conferred upon the President, will have the effect of destroying our republican form of government in this country and making our Government totalitarian, just as was the case in Italy and in Germany under similar conditions of alleged emergency; and

Whereas the grant of such powers is not essential to the supply of any war material to foreign countries which may possibly be spared in the present emergency: Therefore be it

Resolved, That while the American Coalition favors the extension by our country of all appropriate aid to nations which the

American people desire to serve in this hour of peril, it opposes all attempts to give such aid through the employment of dictatorial, totalitarian, or unconstitutional methods; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition condemns any legislative or executive action which under the plea of combatting totalitarianism abroad creates totalitarianism at home.

THE LEND-LEASE BILL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a statement adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at Chicago, Ill., on January 24, 1941.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, representing approximately 700,000 underlying members, expresses its deep-seated conviction that our first obligation is to preserve and defend this country and its form of government.

This board is naturally and properly concerned with various defense proposals, including aid to democratic countries defending themselves against aggressor nations.

We favor the Congress enacting promptly, but after full hearing and debate, laws designed to accomplish the following:

(1) To sell, lease, or give such military properties as now or hereafter may belong to the United States as may have the express approval either of the Congress or any bipartisan committee thereof, to the British Empire and other democracies now or hereafter fighting aggressors, without committing any recognized act of war.

(2) To give the British Empire and other democracies defending themselves from aggressor nations such credit or cash as the Congress may specifically approve.

(3) To give to such democracies such further and additional aid as may be possible, consistent with our own defense requirements, subject to the following express limitations:

(a) That in so doing no recognized act of war be committed;

(b) That no ship owned by the United States or flying its flag be sent into the war zone as defined by the Neutrality Act, except with the prior express approval of the Congress;

(c) That no soldiers, sailors, or other representative of the armed forces of the United States below the rank of captain be sent into the war zone except with the prior approval of the Congress.

The board, while favoring the devotion of all of our energies to creating an impregnable defense and aid, as above set forth, to other nations, challenges the wisdom in the public interest of the so-called lend-lease bill as introduced in the Congress.

Among the several objections to the enactment of this proposed bill (H. R. 1776) are the following:

(a) The President is specifically excluded from the restraining influence of any law.

(b) The President can, without the knowledge of the Congress and over the objection of our Army, naval, and air experts, deliver not only to the British Empire but to other unnamed countries all or a part of our Navy, all or a part of our airplanes, all or a part of our tanks, guns, and other military equipment.

(c) While the bill is not clear in this respect, it is fairly debatable whether the President can, regardless of law, seize the private

property of a military character, or susceptible of military uses, of any individual, firm, or corporation, regardless of the wishes and welfare of the owner, regardless of the knowledge of the Congress, and regardless of the views of our own military experts, and turn them over to unnamed countries.

(d) The President can spend public funds or incur, or have incurred, on behalf of the Government of the United States, financial obligations not limited in amount, not only without the consent but without the prior knowledge of the Congress.

(e) The vast powers proposed to be vested in the President, whoever he may be, by this bill have no limit as to time.

This proposed lend-lease bill would confer upon the Chief Executive such powers as have never heretofore been granted to any President, even when the country was at war. We are not at war, and without doubt the earnest wish of the vast majority of the people is to keep this country out of war. This bill, if enacted into law, by the very power it proposes to grant, creates the possibility of this Nation entering into this war without further action by the Congress.

Such sweeping powers to the Chief Executive are unnecessary and unwise. Congress constantly in session, and alert to the necessities of the Nation, can promptly enact laws to meet any situation not taken care of in the recommendations herein first provided.

As Americans, our first concern should be for America—to insure that it is protected and defended, to keep it at peace, and especially to preserve the freedom of individuals.

This bill should be viewed dispassionately and calmly in the light of our national necessities; and whatever law or laws the Congress in its wisdom may enact on this and related subjects should be after full and free discussion, with the Congress as the direct representative of the people of this country neither abdicating its constitutional powers nor shirking its constitutional responsibilities.

KANSAS SENTIMENT ON LEND-LEASE BILL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, it is not my intention at this time to restate my opposition to passage of the so-called lend-lease bill, proposing to grant dictatorial powers to the President both as to conduct of foreign affairs and the use and expenditure of tens of billions of dollars appropriated by Congress for the defense of the United States.

I desire, however, to call the attention of the Senate to a few of the thousands of letters I am receiving opposing the passage of such all-out delegation of congressional powers to any one man. I wish to state that my mail is running about 2,000 letters a week on this subject, exclusive of form petitions, form letters, and similar organized efforts against this measure. I think it is conservative to state that my mail is running close to 95 percent—certainly more than 90 percent—in opposition to this bill and in opposition to United States intervention in this European war. The impression seems to be more or less general that the purpose of this bill is to give to the President power to intervene under the pretense that the powers are necessary to national defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have a few particularly interesting letters, which I send to the desk, printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, and referred to the committee.

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on For-

eign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRACE CATHEDRAL,
Topeka, Kans., January 7, 1941.
The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is altogether too bad the President did not give his late lamented "fireside chat" before November 5 of last year.

Congress seems to be our last bulwark against entrance into the European conflict; that is, if we are not already in by the "day-to-day decisions" of the Chief Executive. To pledge this Nation to British victory, without knowing what British aims are in this war, seems to me to be the height of folly. If the war in Europe is not simply a continuation of the historic battles of imperialistic nations in Europe, heightened to a degree of insanity, then I have misread European history for the past 150 years.

To call people who don't agree with the President "appeasers" seems to me to be getting dangerously near to something that is far away from democracy. I thoroughly resent any such presumption to a "thus saith the Lord" on the part of the President.

I sincerely hope you will use your good offices to prevent Congress from becoming an expensive rubber stamp. The predominant desire of the people of this Nation is to be kept out of war. They would like the President to explore the possibilities of a negotiated peace. The President willy-nilly has practically pledged this Nation to a dictated peace. Cannot something be done now, before it is too late to stop this mad plunge toward involving us in this bloody, insane conflict?

With warm personal regards and every good wish, I am,

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN WARREN DAY.

SEDAN, KANS., January 20, 1941.

Senator CAPPER.

DEAR SIR: I wish to state that I am opposed to giving any more power to the President, as the current aid-to-England bill proposes. I do not agree with Roosevelt or his frightened followers that America has to hide behind the English Navy or anyone else. America always has and still can defend herself from outside danger. The real danger is from within. With the President now having more power than any other individual in the world, and still asking for more, how long can the republican government last? There is the real danger.

When the credit of the Government is exhausted I can see no way out but dictatorship. And I fear we are very close to that point now.

Hope you will do all you can against the bill to lend material to England.

Yours truly,

EVERETT CRAWFORD.

ELLSWORTH, KANS., January 19, 1941.
Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I am a young man, living on a farm out here in Kansas. Everything has been going well with me up to the present time, but I am fearful of the future. I am proud of our glorious country, and I am especially proud of our heritage, the Constitution of our country, our representative form of government, not to mention religious freedom and many material advantages.

But I am afraid we are about to lose all these things by giving our President too much power. Mr. Roosevelt has enforced more influence upon Congress and the public than any other President, yet he isn't satisfied. His demand for more power must be stopped if we are to retain our democracy.

The proposed lend-lease bill will certainly give the President absolute dictatorial power over Congress and the people of our Nation. Mr. CAPPER, please do not support any policy which will take away our voice in government.

Sincerely,

ALVIN LANGE.

BEVERLY, KANS., January 20, 1941.

Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Just a word to congratulate you on your stand against our participation in any foreign wars and to tell you the great majority of people of this community are 100 percent against the war dictatorship bill, No. 1776.

We are for help to Great Britain, when it does not interfere with defense preparedness here in the United States.

Anything you can do to defeat that bill will be highly appreciated in Kansas as well as in a majority of the other States.

Yours very truly,

MARY E. T. (Mrs. E. E.) KERNOHAN.

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

Kansas City, Kans., January 20, 1941.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the first place, I want to send you personal greetings and most heartily commend you for the good work that you are doing. May the Heavenly Father continue you in your good work.

In the next place, I would like to register my opinion—and in doing so I know that I register the opinions of many of the constituents of my congregation—relative to our attitude toward this impending war. I am very much opposed to involving our country in foreign wars. When I was a young lad I left Europe for America, and I am exceedingly glad to be here. Had I stayed there I might have been dead by this time, as some of my brothers are, having been killed in the wars there; nor do I want my boys to be sent across the seas to be "plowed under" there.

For that reason I oppose the repeal of the Neutrality Act or the Johnson Act, or using the American Navy to facilitate the shipments of munitions to the other countries. I am very much in accord and sympathy with the preparations for our own defense. We want to make ourselves so strong that no aggressor will dare to attack us. Should they do so, my sons will be ready, and I, myself, will fight with them tooth and nail.

It would be most tragic, indeed, for us to enter this war, as it was tragic for us to have entered the World War. Europe's wars are periodical and chronic. Have we gotten to the place where we must step in and fight for them and with them after having had the mental and moral balance for 150 years to stay away from their conflicts?

I hope you will do your utmost to prevent anything that may disturb the peace and tranquillity of our Nation and lead it into this international conflict.

Yours very sincerely,

A. T. TOMSHANY.

THE EVANGELICAL CHURCH,

Abilene, Kans., January 20, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is with strange misgivings that I view the present session of Congress. This Seventy-seventh Congress is the last bulwark for the protection of American democracy against the daring encroachment of a power-drunk President. This Congress, not Great Britain, is the front line of America's defense.

In all sincerity and earnestness, Senator Capper, I fear the encroachment of our dic-

tatorial President more than all the outside threats which are leveled against our American way of life. This Nation's greatest enemy, in my opinion, is now in the White House plotting a course that seems patterned after Mussolini and Hitler. By that I mean that he is bringing every influence possible to bear on Congress to abdicate its democratic powers just like the German Reichstag and the Italian Chamber of Deputies were led to abdicate their powers to Hitler and Mussolini. I fear the same result here. These last 8 years have definitely impressed me with the fact that Mr. Roosevelt is a reckless and wasteful spender of this Nation's resources. His continued leadership fills me with dread for the future of our American way of life.

I sincerely hope you will do everything you can to block the dictatorship aspirations of Mr. Roosevelt. The next thing he may be sending our duly elected representatives home. This is a time that calls for sacrifice on the part of you men that stand between the people and their constitutional freedom and liberties. I do sincerely hope you will do your patriotic duty in the front line of defense of our American way of life. We are depending on you to put up the fight of your life for the preservation of our democracy. There are no decisions that our duly elected representatives cannot make for us better than any dictator can. So we are depending on you and your colleagues to stand by our country in this crisis.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. LUCAS M. NANNINGA.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

Coffeyville, Kans., January 14, 1941.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: Everyone is very much concerned at the present time with the crisis brought on by the war situation. No doubt we are all in sympathy with Great Britain; however, many that I have talked to have said that they do not favor giving so much power to our President, or even the military authorities, so that our country will be in reality a totalitarian government. We still believe that our Congressmen can work these things out to keep our country out of war, and that their opinions will be much wiser than that of one man, who by his actions could cause us to become involved in the European war.

It is amazing how this war psychology works on people. And it is alarming when a President has so much power and at the same time has the majority of the Congress seemingly dependent upon him. Even our courts have the majority of the members appointed by the present President. These agencies, which should be checks upon each other, are far from democracy when they become controlled by one man or by one party.

Cordially yours,

ROBERT W. SCOTT,
Minister.

CITY OF LAWRENCE, KANS.,
January 15, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in favor of giving aid to Great Britain and Canada so long as it does not involve us in actual warfare, and so long as it does not jeopardize domestic defense preparations.

I believe Congress should hear all and work out a definite program as to what this aid is to be, and not delegate any powers to the President which will put this country in a position where it establishes war for itself and cannot back down without humiliation.

I still believe that many minds are better than one and that the Executive is the one to carry out carefully considered congressional

policy. The President, Congress, and the great majority of the people of the United States have established a policy not to send our boys to foreign soil to fight. Let's don't do anything that will necessitate our being drawn into it.

Differences of opinion, hatred and war, has always existed between the countries of Europe and in my opinion always will. I hope the United States will not become so powerful that it will undertake to police and enforce punishment to those countries who cannot get along with and among themselves. Equality cannot be brought about by the strong arm of government.

I want England to win this war because I think she is the better of the two to use reason in determining the rights of mankind and has a sense of fairness in determining the destinies of the vanquished. I am for helping her as long as we have enough ships and war materials to defend ourselves, but the United States comes first. Our men, women, and children will all stand together if war ever comes to our shores.

Your stand all the way has been commendable and we are for you.

Sincerely yours,

E. E. ALEXANDER.

LAWRENCE, KANS., January 15, 1941.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We keep informed of your sentiments as expressed in your Sunday evening radio talks, and I want to commend your attitude toward the pending lease-lend legislation. I am astonished and grieved that Congress continues to surrender its constitutional prerogatives to the Executive, when a recent veto demonstrates the President's determination to retain all the power that he can acquire.

No one man is wise enough or unselfish enough to be trusted with unlimited power over the people of America.

I am glad to have aid given to Great Britain in her struggle to maintain freedom, but all assistance given her by our Government and its relation to our own interests should be passed upon by Congress. So Congress should remain on the job and not shirk its responsibilities as defined by the Constitution and entrusted to it by the people.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. EDWARD BUMGARDNER.

AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS,
Topeka, Kans., January 17, 1941.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: At a recent meeting of the Topeka Chapter of the American War Mothers, we were delegated to convey to you our sincere appreciation of the resolute stand you have taken against the involvement of the United States in the present European war.

As mothers who have borne and reared sons, who, on a foreign battlefield, fought a futile war to end wars, we urge you to continue to challenge such measures as, in your judgment, are harmful, and to steadfastly support legislation designed to strengthen and preserve the safety and welfare of our beloved country.

We are confident that you will meet the momentous decisions you will be called upon to make with the courage and wisdom which have characterized your actions in the past.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CHARLES SPENCER.
Mrs. E. C. FABLE.

ROBERTS, SCHMIDT & ROBERTS,
Wichita, Kans., January 20, 1941.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I listened to your radio address on Sunday evening and I desire to congratulate you on the accurate and correct statement set forth in your address. I approve of every word you said.

It has always been my profound conviction that the United States is not capable of policing Europe, and I think we should make the very clear distinction between selling goods to a friendly nation and assuming the obligation of carrying out the war aims of that foreign nation. If we desire to sell our goods to any nation, we have a right under international law to do so. It is a right that has existed for a thousand years. But when we go a step further and try to assume the burdens of a foreign nation in the carrying on of war, we have gone beyond the duties and rights which we owe to our own people. If we take care of the Western Hemisphere, we have certainly carried out all of the duties and obligations which we owe as a nation.

I hope you are successful in defeating this lend-lease bill.

Yours very truly,

A. V. ROBERTS.

STATE OF KANSAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 20, 1941.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: For lack of more appropriate manner of expressing my feelings, I am today wearing the badge of mourning. Mourning not only for the many fine men who are being led to slaughter, but in a larger sense, the loss of almost everything that our forefathers won at such a cost and which we, as Americans, were supposed to treasure so highly.

In breaking the third-term tradition, we have done much to advance the cause of dictators and others who despise the government of and by free men. For some years, or ever since the New Deal Party has been in power, I have been greatly concerned about the future of our country and "I saw a great cloud approaching; it was filled with tears and blood."

Senator, hopeless as it has been, I appreciate the good fight you have put up in behalf of the few Americans who are yet worthy of the name.

Best of wishes to the end.

Sincerely,

HENRY MURR,
Representative, Sixth District.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., January 19, 1941.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your address tonight you asked for an expression as to how we Kansans felt toward the lend-lease bill.

There can be no question but what you expressed 90 percent of the Kansas feeling. The effects of such a bill are too terrible to contemplate.

If we want to save our country and civilization we must be immune to attacks from all sources, even from the White House. It is a shame that we have a man who preaches unity and then commits acts which compel disunity; one who says there is nothing to fear but fear and then tries to scare the people into a war which is not of their making or desire.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

E. G. WOLESZLAGEL.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 20, 1941.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for your splendid leadership in the fight against the lease-lend bill of the administration.

We of the West and Middle West are not so far removed from pioneer days as to have forgotten the necessity for conserving our resources; and I hold it true that the first step toward disintegration of a great nation is the dissipation of those resources, and equally true that if such dissipation of its resources is allowed to continue, the result must inevitably be the destruction of the Nation.

We are facing such a dissipation now. Someway it must be stopped. We, the greatest of great nations, cannot—must not—give to any one man, for any length of time, long or short, power to dispose of our resources or defenses as and to whom he may see fit.

Do not let the bill pass.

Yours truly,

W. G. MOCK.

STONE, McCURE, WEBB,
JOHNSON & OMAN,
Topeka, Kans., January 21, 1941.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ARTHUR:

I want again to thank you for the stand which you are taking in the affairs of the day. We are going through a very dangerous period. Everyone wants to help Great Britain and hopes that she will win the war. I think we all want to give her all the help that we can, consistent with our own safety. We can, of course, afford to give them a great deal of help in arms and munitions, but there is no reason why they should not reciprocate by paying in money or possessions so long as they are able. But the most dangerous thing we are called upon to do is to vest such uncalled-for powers in the President. I hope that you will do everything you can to modify the lend-lease act so that it does not convey such unlimited power.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT STONE.

IOLA, KANS., January 19, 1941.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: This evening we listened to your broadcast, and we wish to say again that we are opposed to the President's program; we do not think the Congress should give anyone such authority as this bill will give to the President. No time in the history of our country has a President asked for such authority, and as I remember the history of our country we have passed through some very trying times. The following Presidents all passed through difficult times: Washington, Madison, Lincoln, McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson. During their terms as President there were wars, both internal and external, yet they never asked the Congress for any such power.

No, Senator, we are opposed to this measure. If the Congress passes this request of the President, then why a Congress, and why talk of Dictator Hitler? President Roosevelt will be a greater dictator; I suppose that is what he wants.

We are for national preparedness, and we are willing that Congress should pass any laws that in its judgment are needed for the operation of national defense and we are willing to pay any tax that we possibly can so that this country of ours may be in a position to defend itself. But, Senator, we are not

willing for this Government to agree that it will furnish all the war materials that other governments may need to fight their wars.

Many say that England is fighting our war. Now, Senator, we all know better than that—England is fighting to preserve itself, and the possessions she controls.

Do I want Hitler and Germany to win this war? Certainly not. I am willing to help England as much as we can, and I believe that you also wish to do that very thing; but we are not willing that this country should go bankrupt, and if we do as the President asked, that is what will happen.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. A. R. SLEEPER.

HOPE, KANS., January 17, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR:

I am a traveling salesman, traveling over more than two-thirds of Kansas, and I talk with many people every day.

So far I have not found a single person who wants war. . . . They all think we can stay out of war unless it comes to us. Then they are almost as unanimous in wanting everything done to be ready to meet the conditions if they arise. About 90 percent of the people of Kansas are in favor of helping England and Greece and China to the limit. That is the expression of the people of Kansas.

Now, here are my views: The President tells us in broad platitudes that we are going to arm ourselves and fight for the four freedoms.

Take, for instance, his first freedom: Freedom of speech. He says that we will never stop until we have freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world. Then inside of a week he uses his position to abuse and belittle a good, honest Senator who has the manhood to stand up and tell him he is taking the United States straight into war.

He should have said freedom of speech everywhere in the world except in the United States.

Well, take the second: Freedom of worship. He calls the Christian organizations who are opposed to getting us into war a bunch of appeasers.

The third: Freedom from want.

How about the people of Kansas? The recent census shows that in the west half of the State half of the farms have been abandoned. He had them kill off the pigs and old cows and sell off the chickens and everything that the people had; and, of course, they had to leave their farms.

No wonder Kansas loses a Congressman because of shrinkage of population, and we are saddled down with a debt that will take all one-fourth of our population can earn to pay it in the next 100 years.

Freedom from fear: Of course, the President is not afraid of war. But when there seems to be no sane reason for our getting into the war, the people of Kansas are afraid they will be dragged into a war by a President who can find no other "emergency" to put forth for spending the remainder of the wealth that is left in the country.

Spend money to make ourselves impregnable and spend what is necessary to help the countries fighting the Axis, but keep out of the war. And, by the way, let England

turn over some of the islands in the West Indies for the help. We can use them better than England.

Very truly yours,

W. A. COOK.

MYERS CLINIC,

Kansas City, Mo., January 18, 1941.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SENATOR:

I cannot see any reason for Congress committing its powers, rights, and duties to anyone. If it is correct that "in a multitude of councilors there is wisdom," surely an assembly of men like the Senate should be of help to the country, when wisdom is so much needed.

Personally, I do not believe any one man can direct affairs more wisely than the representatives of the people, if they are intelligent and patriotic, as I take it they are.

I have much sympathy for England, and I have no objection to any program of assistance, compatible with our policy of neutrality, but I fear we are going too fast and too far. At least I hope Congress will not surrender its powers. If an emergency is ahead, surely a majority of Congress will be capable of seeing and meeting it.

Very respectfully,

B. L. MYERS.

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION CATHEDRAL,
Leavenworth, Kans., January 17, 1941.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I was pleased to read of your opposition to the lease-lend bill.

The founding fathers of our country thought that it should be left to Congress to decide when and if this Nation should go to war. This was the conviction of great men, arrived at by their observation of history and by their appreciation of man's inalienable right to the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness. This conviction they embodied in our inimitable Constitution, thus reserving by law this right to the people through their chosen Representatives.

Events of the past decade make it our conviction also that the right to involve a nation in war must remain in the hands of the people. I spent 4 years in Europe shortly before the present conflagration there. I have it from the lips of the people of the chief countries involved in this mad brawl that they, the ruled class, did not want war. This war, its privations, sorrow, and death, therefore, was foisted upon them, because the right to decide in regard to war was not up to them.

The extent of the ambiguous powers hidden in the lease-lend bill no one seems to know, but almost all know that they are alarmingly vast. If it is dictatorship that we are opposed to, then let us not convert our Government into a dictatorship. And let Congress, made up of the people's representatives, retain the power that the Constitution rightfully gives it.

Sincerely yours for the preservation of our constitutional rights,

Rev. A. H. WIETHARN,
Assistant.

EMPORIA, KANS., January 11, 1941.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You asked for letters telling our opinions. Now, tonight several friends visited us, and we all heard your broadcast, and

we all agreed that if you saw fit to vote for or against a bill it would be what you thought was best for all of us, and only wished you could vote enough times to keep us out of a mess.

We don't want to see England beaten, but how will it help us for her to win? We didn't benefit from "the war to end wars."

Now, if it will help you in any way, here is our opinion:

First. Keep America for Americans.

Second. Put a stopper on the President and let Congress keep its rightful place.

Third. Pass laws to insure sane elections.

It seems like people should have the persons they want in office.

Fourth. Curb the tenure of office of President.

Fifth. But most of all, keep the money and its distribution and the power to declare war, etc., in the hands of the legislators.

I think most Kansans feel you will do the best and, as you see it, will help Kansas as you have always done.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. O. E. WELSON,
Mrs. R. W. YOUNGREEN.

JANUARY 17, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: . . . Uphold the Johnson Act at all times. I am firmly against making loans to foreign countries at war. Surely, our experience after the last war collecting such debts is warning enough.

Use your influence to urge Congressmen to keep their policy-making power in their own hands. The fate of our democracy is more at stake in Washington, D. C., than in any foreign country's threat of war or invasion.

Uphold the Neutrality Act. Let us not convoy shipments of munitions with units of our Navy. That is sticking our necks out entirely too far.

Fight the graft in the preparedness program. Let's get as much for our tax appropriation as is humanly possible, and let's keep a safe percentage of the new equipment right here in the United States. We might share with England if it seems the intelligent thing to do, but do not give all.

Most sincerely yours,

LUCILE CORSON,
(Mrs. Keith T. Corson).

AUGUSTA, KANS., January 13, 1941.
Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER:

At this time I wish to express my appreciation to you and to the other Kansas Congressmen for their frank expressions of opinion regarding the legislation recommended by our President. As one American among many, I think, we should give aid to Great Britain, but I do not think we are under any obligation to send armed forces overseas to fight the English battles. Much as we all abhor the Nazi regime and way of domination, I do not feel that England is fighting our war or for us. I am sure we all want England to win and to that end will aid with supplies to the limit. I am also sure that we all want America made so strong that no nation can attack us or will try to subjugate the American Nation.

In common with many who have expressed their opinions, I feel that our President went

too far in implying that we are ready to back any nation anywhere in a struggle to ward off aggressor nations against their democracies. That is a large order, and I personally doubt if we are able to do it if we wished to do it.

The recent political campaign was waged on the basis of no involvement in European affairs to the extent of sending an expeditionary force overseas. I still think we should hold the National Government to that agreement. And I believe the American people will hold fast to that agreement and understanding.

I am, very truly,

J. W. MURPHY.

HERKIMER, KANS., January 13, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I believe that I am supporting unity by not supporting the President in his present stand. Unity in a democracy can only be based upon majority rule. I hold that the President knows that his present warlike attitude is not the majority wish. He knows it because he didn't dare to risk his reelection on his present platform. His reelection platform was peace and prayer; now it's war and hate. Hence, all who oppose the President are supporting unity or democratic rule. Kill bill No. 1776 by all means.

Next, if an ocean is no longer a barrier to the East, neither is it a barrier to the West. Suppose, then, we go to the rescue of England. Wouldn't that be the opportune moment for Japan to stab us in the back? We were told by our administration only a short while ago that we were on the brink of war with Japan, and is Japan a much less formidable enemy than Hitler? That's the responsibility which is upon the Senate and the House, and we don't want that responsibility vested in our President, who deceived us in his reelection platform.

If our administration had hearkened to Lindbergh and Billy Mitchell, instead of court-martialing and "smearing" them, we could now have confidence in its leadership. But as it is, we don't. So don't surrender the prerogatives of Congress to any one man, not for even 1 day.

If Congress surrenders, then it ought to go home and save the taxpayers the needless expense of supporting it in Washington.

Very truly yours,

H. W. E. BUSS.

BERNARD, KANS., January 14, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It is obvious that England cannot win the present European war without our assistance as an active ally and our financial backing. So what? So America must enter the war to save democracy? To use a Kansan's expression for its superlative emphasis, Not by a damned sight.

It would mean a long war, during which many of our democratic privileges would be lost—and many of them might never be returned. It would mean world exhaustion, with the worst possible consequences.

It would be better for us and better for the world for England to lose than for America and England to exhaust themselves, as well as the rest of the world, in years of battle, win or lose. Help England. Yes; to the extent of her ability to pay either in cash or territory; but look first to our own defense.

Muzzle Roosevelt to prevent more incendiary "fireside" talks.

Help keep us out of war, so that when these conflicts are ended there may be a strong,

solvent nation to be a nucleus for world rehabilitation.

Let us be governed by reason, not emotion. It is going to be tough under any condition, so keep on arming first ourselves, then England.

Respectfully yours,

W. G. EMERY, M. D.

SALINA, KANS., January 13, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you concerning the question of granting the President the right to go as far as he sees fit about giving aid to Great Britain. If no limit is set, I wonder where we will be, as he has shown no judgment in money matters so far. Why is no more being said about the United States taking some islands that belong to Great Britain in payment for war supplies? British aid is all right to a certain degree, but what will we do if we keep giving and get no security? Our own Nation cannot stand too much of this. When we are weakened—and we all know there is a lot of discontent in America now—will it not be much easier for someone to overpower us? Please keep up the fight and be ever watchful so our boys are never sent over. If we give our strongest men every 20 years, we are weakening our Nation in the worst way. Fight on, and may God be with you, is my prayer.

Mrs. FRANK WEIS.

FORT SCOTT, KANS., January 15, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: While we may all wish Britain to win the war, I find no one who is in favor of giving the President any more power over the lives and property of our citizens; Congress has given the President far too much power already.

Congress is not fair with our citizens; they were elected to represent the people of the United States, not Europe, or to surrender their power to the President; otherwise why have a Congress at all?

The aid-to-Britain bill should be killed, as it now stands.

Do not just vote against the bill, put up a fight, keep the power over our citizens in Congress and we will not get into war.

Do not compromise.

Very truly,

G. T. CAMPBELL.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., January 14, 1941.

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am not in favor of the Senators and Representatives of the United States turning over the reins of government to any President.

Furthermore, I am not in favor of the blank-check business. Would it be sound business? It seems to me we are altogether too near the precipice already and would not take much of a shove to be landed at the bottom. It looks to me like the war situation is getting worse.

I hope you will be blest with courage to stand by what you know is right.

Please do what you can to save the young men of this land.

Sincerely,

Mrs. E. P. WARNER.

ESKRIDGE, KANS., January 14, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are deeply concerned about the lend-and-lease bill. We feel much safer with Congress controlling our interests rather than one man.

We know we can depend on you to do your part. You are a clear-thinking man and can interpret legislation in its true light. The administration tries to mislead the people and does not tell the people the true significance of much of its legislation.

We want Congress to hold Roosevelt to his reelection promises.

If Roosevelt is given more power, he will never want to give it up.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM JUNKIN.

WAMEGO, KANS., January 14, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I listen to your address every Sunday afternoon, and I was much impressed with your talk last Sunday.

I wish to say in regard to the powers President Roosevelt is asking the Congress to give him regarding aid to foreign countries. I think Congress should decide what aid should be given Great Britain and other countries. I feel the American people send representatives to Congress to guard their rights, and should Congress designate these powers to the President, it is giving the constitutional rights away against the wishes of the people.

We are spending vast sums of money to down the dictators in other countries, at the same time building up a dictatorship in America. It seems strange Congress cannot see this.

I think we should send all possible aid to Great Britain and other countries fighting against aggression but repeat that Congress should decide what the aid shall be and the manner of sending, and not give it over to a dictator.

Your talk last Sunday indicated that you have the correct idea. Hold fast the reins. We hope to defeat Hitler in Europe; let us not set up another here.

Very truly yours,

(Miss) RACHEL MCCOY.

MARION, KANS., January 9, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: In these troubled times we, the common people of Kansas, are very happy to have you serve as our real representative in the United States Senate. We wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand against involvement in Europe's war.

Dear Senator CAPPER, will you please remind our dear President that he was elected President of the United States and not of the British Empire or of the world?

We have supported you in public office for a quarter of a century—first as Governor of Kansas, then as United States Senator—and will continue to do so as long as you represent us as you so truly and ably do now.

If anyone questions our patriotism, remind him that we had three brothers in active service in the World War, and that Abram Clark, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, was one of our forefathers.

Most respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. D. C. EITZEN.

GUILFOYLE & SCOTT,

Abilene, Kans., January 11, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: It seems that the President and Congress are trying too hard to get into the European war.

During the World War I volunteered shortly after war was declared. I served better than 2 years, more than 1 of which was spent in France. I am a past commander of the Legion post at both Herington and Abilene.

I am a firm believer that this country must make extraordinary preparation for defense, but I think some attention should be paid to seeing that the members of our Army and Navy are kept in this country, and that we not go overseas or out on the waters looking for trouble.

"Defense" means defense of this country and not "defense of the King." No candidate for President or Congress would have been elected at the last election if he would have advocated a policy of using the lives of our young men and the property of our citizens to police the whole world.

Yours truly,

MATT GUILFOYLE.

PRESCOTT, KANS., January 14, 1941.

The Honorable Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am protesting to you against Congress giving the Executive the dictatorial power asked for in the pending bill before Congress. What is the matter with this Congress—are they trying to sabotage the Constitution? They have already very definitely weakened our democratic form of government by delegating to others authority they should have retained. All possible aid to Britain—yes; but not at the expense of bankrupting and otherwise wrecking our form of government. We have passed through far more graver perils as a Nation without Congress quitting the people, and we can do so again if we have the right kind of leadership at the head of our Government.

If Congress passes this bill in its present form, I think there is far more danger to our democratic form of government from within than from any combination of dictators from abroad.

It seems to me this is the most absurd and dictatorial piece of legislation ever submitted to any Congress of the United States.

I don't think Congress should issue any blank checks and should retain all the power granted it by the Constitution.

Your very truly,

C. W. MCQUITT.

PALMER, KANS., January 14, 1941.

To the Honorable Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

This lending and lease measure must be defeated in its entirety if we are to stay out of this war. Think of the horrible consequences if we get into this war. We have but one boy of the draft age, but that boy is dearer to us than all the riches in the world.

If we want to stay out of this war, there must be a limit to our sympathies for England. Bad as it may be, an English defeat will not be as bad for this beloved country of ours as an active participation in the war would be. We are for a strong national defense, so strong that Hitler will never dare to attack us, but we are definitely opposed to ever sending a single American soldier to fight on foreign soil anywhere.

Very respectfully yours,

EMIL MEIER.
Mrs. EMIL MEIER.

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Topeka, Kans., January 7, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER:

America had nothing to do with the first World War. We were dragged into it to help

save democracy and to help win a war to end all wars. Neither of these things was the result of victory. In addition to the blood and billions in treasure that was poured out to help England and her Allies win the war, we loaned Europe about \$10,000,000,000 to help repair the damages of war, and when we asked them to pay back the loan they called us Uncle Shylock. This loan has not yet been paid, and never will be paid, unless England and France, and the other nations that owe us, turn over to us their land possessions in or near the Western Hemisphere. This is for the old debt. I am in favor of that.

I am not in favor of the leasing-lending program which the President has suggested. That will simply result in a gift to England. I am not in favor of the United States of America financing this war for England, or anyone else. If we furnish England and other nations with war munitions, and their money runs out, let them furnish us with rubber, tin, coffee, spices, sugar, or anything else necessary to balance the Budget. We need a lot of those things and can use them.

If the United States should attempt to finance the European war, how long would it be before we become bankrupt? And if we did finance it, how long would it be before we would not have a friend among the nations of Europe, as it was during the last war, after we stopped loaning money to them?

I want the United States to do anything and everything she can do to furnish materials to England, and furnish that help as fast as possible, and thus help her win the war providing she comes here and gets what she needs, and uses her own ships for convoys. I think I voice the sentiment of 90 percent of the veterans of the United States when I say we, who have been in war and know what it is, don't want war as long as this country can stay out with honor, but if any nation starts to invade us or attack our shores we will volunteer in America's defense to the last man.

HARRY W. BRENT,
Department Commander.

NEWTON, KANS., January 5, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: We fully agree with you that it is time to speak out against war and hope that the American people will not be roped in this time like they were in the other World War to end wars. I surely hope that you will have more help from the new Congress in holding this war party in check and keep the United States out of Europe's war.

I believe that the majority are in favor of extending aid to Great Britain, but I do not believe anything like a majority would favor going so far as to lead us down the road to war. As you already know, Kansas voted against President Roosevelt, and, as all other thinking people, I do not believe Kansas people wants the United States to get into somebody else's war. Believe we should put our own house in order first and fully agree with you that America of first importance and the protection of our American boys and not place a debt on a generation yet unborn.

Yours very truly,

R. E. HAZZARD.

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE OF
AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
Manhattan, Kans., January 6, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: President Roosevelt's address on the state of the Union was an emotional appeal for war. Well, do I remember the same emotional appeals "to save the world for democracy" that were made

from 1914 to 1917. The President says "They do not need men." He also says "Hitlerism must be destroyed." He knows that if Hitlerism is destroyed Britain must conquer Germany. He knows that that means an invasion of Germany. When Britain gets ready to invade Germany everybody knows she will ask for millions of our young men. What will the President do when that time comes?

I am opposed to fighting Europe's wars, and I find 90 percent of the people with whom I talk agree with me. I believe in preparedness, all the preparedness that our trained military engineers think is necessary to protect America from an invasion by any foreign power or combination of foreign powers. The only way we can help save democracy is to save America, the last stronghold of democracy. The only way to save our American democracy is to solve our domestic problems. Fighting wars overseas is the surest way to destroy it.

The people of Kansas are with you in your fight to keep our country out of Europe's wars. May God Almighty help you to continue this fight, even in the face of the President's threat to use shame and after that, the strong arm of the Government on those who do not fall into line.

Most sincerely yours,

EDWIN L. HOLTON,
Head, Department of Education.

ATTICA, KANS., December 31, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As our elected representative in the Senate, we urge that you do all in your power to keep this country out of any foreign wars. We urge that your first and greatest consideration during the coming months shall be to keep this country at peace. We believe that with adequate protection and alert vigilance this country is not in danger of invasion by the Axis, and we urge sufficient protection and increased vigilance.

We realize that economic suffering might follow an Axis victory in Europe but we feel that loss of income from lost markets, and shortages in material needs are not worth the sacrifice of human life. We are confident that American spirit and brains can work out a solution to that problem, but they cannot bring dead soldiers to life again. We urge your attention to that problem, and also your continued effort in the fight to assure every American of adequate economic security.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) MARGARET MONTZINGO.
(Miss) LAURA MONTZINGO.

IDANA, KANS., January 1, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR H. CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER:

I want to tell you that I endorse every word you say in your radio addresses, and am profoundly thankful that my Senator stands for the interests, traditions, and ideals of America. The Government in Washington, it seems to me, is top-heavy with officials who think in terms of what is for the advantage of England rather than what is for the advantage of the United States.

The argument that Britain is fighting America's battle never had any appeal for me.

I refer people in my church and congregation and community to your addresses and articles, and urge them to stand back of their Senator. And in pulpit and personal contacts I am taking the same stand you have taken.

You may count on my active support during the coming critical session of Congress.
Sincerely yours,

Rev. JOHN V. WRIGHT.

MORGAN FARMS,
Hutchinson, Kans., January 7, 1941.

Hon. Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We want no war. We want peace. I am willing to help to defend my country, if attacked, but I do not believe in helping England every time she gets into trouble with Germany.

Can't we prepare to defend ourselves without joining England?

Let us stay out of war, so we can be prosperous, strong, and free. If we keep out of war, we can be so strong that no one will dare to attack us.

The American people want to stay out.

I thank you for your uncompromising stand for peace in the past, and ask you to work even harder for peace in the future.

Yours truly,

HUBERT MORGAN.

REPUBLICAN CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, Kans., January 9, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR:

The people in this section are just as violently opposed to war as they ever were.

We feel that you have been honest and above misrepresentation to your constituents and have their trust and respect as a consequence.

You well know that the voters in Washington County were never deceived by promises, commodities, or any other hand-outs offered before election, so they are not in danger of losing their heads when giving their honest opinion on sending their men to war.

Please bear in mind that the Republican representatives of the Kansas people who are now in the Senate and House are the buffers between them and the throne. We realize your predicament and appreciate your continued efforts in our behalf.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) ELIZABETH GROODY.

JUNCTION CITY, KANS., January 8, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR:

I am pleased to note that you are working to keep the United States out of war. After listening to the President Monday, I am not very optimistic about your being able to do so. I very much fear that he is leading us down the road to an actual declaration of war. I agree with many of the writers that we are already in this war, but I am in hopes that we can avoid actual participation in it other than we are now doing. I have a decided feeling that the President is so anxious to become the dominating world figure that he is willing to sacrifice principle and lives, if needed, to accomplish his ambition. I hope I am misjudging him, but at least that is the way I feel about it just now. I will admit that I am quite prejudiced and perhaps ought to have more confidence in the head of our Government, but I am stating to you frankly my reaction to his speech of Monday.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

I. M. PLATT.

FOWLER, KANS., January 8, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We believe in reasonable, adequate defense, but not war hysteria. We believe in Lindbergh, Senator Wheeler, and Senator Capper's strong stand against war.

We do not think we should commit suicide because Europe does, nor do we think our country should finance England and fight her battles.

We don't want a dictator out of President Roosevelt.

Don't let our country take the same road she did in 1917, all in vain.

A heart-broken widow, with four sons, thanking you for your good efforts.

Yours truly,

SENA C. HILDEBRAND.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 12, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I want to add my voice to the chorus of those protesting against giving the President such unlimited power as seems to be included in the Barkley-McCormack bill. Congress should keep its responsibilities, but un-American, dictatorial prerogatives should not be handed over to the Chief Executive. I believe in helping Britain and helping her soon, but not at such an expense.

Yours truly,

(Miss) HARRIET A. TOMSON.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 12, 1941.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SENATOR:

Now is a time of real crisis, brought on to a great extent by our President and his advisers. What about his solemn promises during the recent campaign? We criticize Hitler for not keeping his word. Can Roosevelt be trusted if he thus casts aside his solemn assurances and tries to lead us into war? Who has appointed him guardian and policeman of the world?

Likely results if Congress gives Roosevelt that requested blank check: Soon thousands upon thousands, perhaps millions, of our American boys dying on battlefields of two or more continents; complete loss of democracy at home and dictatorship, revolution, and chaos.

Congress can prevent all this if it stays American and declares, "Millions for defense (of our country), but not one boy, not one American ship, in the war zone."

If too many Senators and Congressmen are so un-American that they favor war, why not let the American people—who must shed their blood and pay the costs—decide in a referendum—not a silly poll—after having heard both sides—interventionists and non-interventionists?

Respectfully and sincerely,

A. C. GILKER.

BURCH, LITOWICH & ROYCE,
Salina, Kans., January 10, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The general feeling of this community is that there should be more action and less loose talk with reference to the preparation of the defense of this country. Most people are in favor of all aid to England short of war, and many of them cannot see the necessity of the arrogant statements made by the President, which needlessly provoke the Axis Powers.

There is no criticism of spending money for defense, and there is a general feeling

that taxes should be levied so that the immense debt will be cut down, or at least steps toward that direction.

I trust these statements may be helpful to you in your present responsibility, which is a grave one.

With best regards, I am,

Yours truly,

E. S. HAMPTON.

MANHATTAN, KANS., January 16, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

The Riley County (Kans.) Men's Republican Club, of 550 members, commends you for your application to pressing duties and urges upon you a still closer study of the many current problems. Our conviction is you are absolutely justified in attempts to keep staggering sums of money and unlimited powers out of the hands of any one man, and to keep government largely within the hands of duly elected representatives of the people.

RILEY COUNTY (KANS.) MEN'S
REPUBLICAN CLUB.

AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE,
Kansas City, Mo., January 24, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As the people's representative of the Middle West, I trust you will give consideration to Colonel Lindbergh's recent suggestions.

While he possibly may not be right in every respect, I am sure it is the opinion of thousands of members of the America First Committee, of which I have the honor to be acting chairman of the Kansas City chapter, and also the opinion of thousands of the members of Stay Out of Foreign Wars Society, of which I have the pleasure of being founder, that America should stay out of any foreign wars.

The vast majority of the people of the great Middle West, whom you have the honor to represent, do not want war. They are, however, heartily in favor of the United States taking all necessary steps to properly defend America.

As Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago, stated last night, "for us to become involved in any European war is suicide," and, furthermore, as stated by both Lindbergh and Hutchins and many others of note lately, the lease-lend bill, especially in its present form, is definitely a most dangerous step toward war, and, furthermore, it grants too much authority for any one man to have. This authority can be best used by Congress, not by any President.

I trust therefore you will weigh all the facts before you lend your support to any movement that might involve us in a foreign war. I repeat, the people of the great Middle West are depending on you to keep us out of war.

May God give you wisdom to do this.

Yours respectfully,

AMERICA FIRST COMMITTEE,
By RAY F. MOSELEY,
Acting Chairman.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 5, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please bear in mind that you are in the Senate, along with others sent from Kansas—to Congress—to express the wish and will of Kansas people, and they do not want war; neither do they want legislation such that its only outcome can be, will be, war. There is a law on the statute books now—the Johnson law—which, be its virtues what they may be, is a law.

The unbelievable thing has happened—to circumvent this law. The President of this country has hatched up a crack-brained idea, aided by that supersoundrel, Harry Hopkins, to defeat the intent of this law.

It is no wonder that progress toward defense production lags. There is a lack of confidence in the man who insists on holding all the strings in his own hands and then imputes to others, manufacturers, etc., as being slow on the job, whereas they have every reason to hesitate, not knowing what he will pull out of his bag of tricks.

He has used every means at hand to get rid of the Dies committee, but it should be continued, and with appropriations sufficient for its needs.

The powers given or appropriated by Roosevelt should be regained by Congress. There is a job for you.

It is a crime, nothing less, to vote unlimited spending to the President. We must have defense, but there must be a measure of sanity in it, and that is where Congress should come in. Just a yes vote to every demand won't be sane.

Very truly yours,

LURA MAY SHORT.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 8, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It is with deep feeling, much beyond my power of description, that I, as first an intensely concerned citizen of these great United States; second, as a mother of a son who will unquestionably be among the first to be called into service; and, thirdly, because I feel that something must be done before it is too late and we shall be swept into actual war, that I write to you as one who expresses the opinions of the people here in Kansas.

Already we have gone too far, but is the situation beyond hope?

We must do something.

By the stark declarations made by the President in his speech to Congress on Monday he has left us a frightened, disillusioned people.

He extols the rights of free thought and free speech; that is what he tells us he is fighting for; but he calls us appeasers and slackers because we choose to exercise that right of free thought and free speech and do not follow blindly his uncertain and evasive actions.

There is not a doubt in the mind of any thinking person but that we are experiencing a serious and acutely dangerous situation. We naturally need and demand every possible and available article necessary for our defense, but this is only what we should have at all times, not only when such emergencies arise; but in this immediate crisis we are being literally thrust into war before we, the people, are aware of what is really taking place.

I feel a personal responsibility to plead with you, and every red-blooded American woman should feel the same, and by pleading—yes; demanding—that our representative spokesmen shall do everything within their power to keep Congress at the helm during these alarming days.

Does our Congress still represent the will of the people, or has it degenerated into a body of "yes" men, unwilling and afraid lest its Members will be punished by loss of political patronage? Are you going to sit passively submitting to all the President's wartime ideas?

Please stand your ground on the opinions you gave in your radio talk last Sunday evening. It was splendid. Let's have more like it.

Mr. Roosevelt will ask for more power, and then additional power, due to this emergency; but for heaven's sake set a limited time for the expiration of such power, granting more dominion as further emergencies arise.

This is a time of great responsibility for you men in our United States Congress. May

the gravity of this responsibility be met with noble courage and solemnity and may a Divine hand guide you all in this important task.

Most sincerely,

MARGARET MACFARLAND.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE,
Hays, Kans., January 21, 1941.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I urge you to oppose the so-called lease-lend bill; first, because it surrenders the principles of democracy for which Mr. Roosevelt proclaims such a firm devotion. Second, it grants in peacetime powers to the President which he should only have in a critical war situation such as existed in England when Churchill became prime minister. Third, it provides no time limit, and, therefore, may prove a stepping stone to a dictatorship. Fourth, it provides insufficient guaranties for the payment of the materials, proposed to be loaned or leased, and fifth, it does not protect the United States against the possibility of her again holding the empty bag while Great Britain adds thousands of square miles to her empire. I think we should by all means show that we have enough intelligence to profit from our experience in the World War. If England cannot pay for her aid, she can at least give us the protection of her territories in the Western Hemisphere. The trade relations that might be developed with these territories would in time be a compensation for the sacrifices and loans made by us to save Great Britain.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. REED,

Professor of Psychology.

TOPEKA, KANS., January 23, 1941.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In your radio talk Sunday you requested an expression from the folks back home as to their opinion on your position on the lease-lend bill now pending in Congress.

I listened carefully to your comments last Sunday and I thoroughly agree with everything you said regarding the same, and it is rather difficult for me to understand how anybody, who would give the matter any thought at all, would feel like it was at all consistent with our form of government to give as much power to President Roosevelt, or anybody else, as the lease-lend bill would automatically give him.

I appreciate your opposition to such a bill in face of the apparent favorable sentiment it seems to have created in Washington, although I do not believe the bill is accepted with such favor in this community.

With best personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

TINKHAM VEALE.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 77) making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo-ship construction, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 7) thereon.

Mr. BYRNES, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 54) extending the authority to investigate the administration of J. Ross Eakin as Superintendent of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park (submitted by Mr. Mc-

KELLAR on the 23d instant), reported it without amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 677. A bill authorizing the city of Wheeling, W. Va., to purchase and construct, maintain and operate, bridges across the Ohio River located wholly or partly within said city; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 678. A bill granting an increase of pension to Robert Blake; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of C. W. Smith, B. F. Couk, and J. H. Hobbs; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 680. A bill to prohibit the employment of persons by the United States at a compensation of \$1 a year, and to provide that persons employed by the United States shall be compensated on a reasonably adequate basis; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BALL:

S. 681. A bill for the relief of Arthur Edgar Scroggin; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 682. A bill granting a pension to Marion L. Sargent; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 683. A bill to expedite the national defense program by providing a method for the settlement of labor disputes in defense industries without resort to hasty strikes and lock-outs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADAMS:

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Ira W. Baldwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate bill 685, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Brizendine; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 687. A bill granting a pension to Carl D. Ziska; and

S. 688. A bill to provide for the free importation of flax scutching or decorticating machinery; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRNES:

S. 689. A bill for the relief of Ed. Dunmack, Jr.;

S. 690. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ben Washington; and

S. 691. A bill for the relief of George Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 692. A bill for the relief of Anna Mattil and others; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 693. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. Merriman; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Ladislav Frank; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 695. A bill relating to custodial employees in buildings under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 696. A bill for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

S. 697. A bill relating to the deferment of college and university students from training and service in the land or naval forces under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 698. A bill to provide for the construction and equipment of a building for the experiment station of the Bureau of Mines at Rolla, Mo.; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 699. A bill prohibiting the operation of motor vehicles in interstate commerce by unlicensed operators; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 2 years; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 33, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

PUBLIC DEFENDER FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am re-introducing for appropriate reference a bill providing for the appointment of a public defender in the District of Columbia. This measure has the approval of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia and also a number of labor groups and citizens associations. I am also introducing another bill which provides public defenders for all the Federal district courts.

Despite the claim made by some lawyers and judges that the accused is always amply safeguarded under our law, and that the conviction of an innocent person is impossible, the fact remains that striking instances of miscarriages of justice constantly are brought to public attention.

Newspaper reports are continually referring to cases of innocent men who have been wrongfully convicted because of their inability to make a proper defense or to produce adequate proofs in their favor at the trial.

The criminal law must be so amended that the poor and helpless defendant shall be accorded the same adequate defense as is given to the wealthy malefactor. No one should be compelled to suffer because of his race, creed, or purse.

The system of "assigned counsel" should give way to the more enlightened system of public defense to those who are unable properly to defend themselves.

The office of public defender, where it has been tested in this country, has resulted in avoiding unnecessary trials, in the more efficient administration of justice, and in saving expense to the community.

Recent developments in aid of the public-defender movement have been significant and indicate that the public defender is likely to become a part of our system of criminal law in the near future.

Public defense of accused persons long since has passed the experimental stage in this country and is now an accomplished fact in many communities where the office of public defender has been established by legislative enactment or local provision. Among those communities are Los Angeles; Portland, Oreg.; Omaha; New Haven; Hartford; Bridgeport; Minneapolis; Pittsburgh; Memphis; Wilmington, N. C.; Columbus, Ohio; Evansville; Cincinnati; Dallas; Oakland, Calif.; San Francisco; and Temple, Tex. The comments of judges, district attorneys, and lawyers in these cities, notably in Los Angeles, where the office has been in operation for over 10 years, are most favorable. I think it is time that the city of Washington should be added to this

list of progressive cities of America which have adopted this progressive program.

This proposed reform has received strong approval in a Nation-wide preferential vote taken by the National Economic League with respect to this and other reforms looking toward an improvement in the administration of justice.

The proper defense of indigent persons accused of crime is, in my judgment, a necessary counterpart of public prosecution. The state should shield the innocent as well as protect society against the criminal.

It is true that under the law an accused person has the presumption of innocence until proved guilty. But in practice society and in too many instances prosecutors take just the opposite view; namely, that the accused is guilty unless he can prove himself innocent.

It is also true that in theory, and I will say that primarily in practice, the function of a prosecuting attorney is to defend in his own office the presumption that a suspected person is innocent until the prosecutor has sifted the available evidence and has himself become convinced that the person is guilty of crime. We put upon the public prosecutor the double role of prosecutor and defender. But his principal function is to prosecute and not to defend. It is impossible for him adequately to perform the double role, even though he conscientiously attempts to do so. The popular impression that many defendants are persecuted rather than prosecuted is not without reason. While there are fair-minded prosecutors with a keen sense of justice, unfortunately too many of them are dominated by the desire to make a record. To them, accusation is often equivalent to proof. The average prosecutor scents guilt not innocence. The tendency of many prosecutors to seek convictions has been frequently commented on by the appellate courts. The law reports abound with criticisms directed against overzealous and ambitious prosecutors "who run dangerous, foolish, and unprofessional risks to secure a conviction," and who often evince "ignorance of the ordinary rules of evidence or disregard the interests of both the people and the defendant, which alike require that a trial should be had according to law."

The failure of the assigned-counsel system generally in vogue in the United States is too evident to require elaborate discussion. It is sufficient to say that this system has been a source of constant criticism and attack for many years by those coming in contact with the criminal courts. It is fundamentally wrong from nearly every standpoint. It is as unfair to counsel as it is to the accused. Accused persons are entitled to a real defense, not a perfunctory one. Even the crook is entitled to a fair trial. Under our Constitution, any person charged with crime is entitled to competent counsel. He is entitled to a fair trial, which means that he should have every facility and resource to produce the law or the facts bearing upon the question of his guilt or innocence.

Assigned lawyers are required to serve without compensation. Assuming that the accused person is fortunate enough to have a competent and conscientious lawyer assigned to him, it must be obvious that with the best skill and attention it is impossible for him to cope with the power, strength, and resources of the prosecution. He has no money available to pay the expense of witnesses, fees of experts, and to take appeals. Too frequently defendants are compelled to suffer not because they are guilty but because they are poor.

The public defender is a step toward the democracy of justice, and as such it should appeal to all fair-minded people. It means a real equality before the law and will result in changing the present attitude of the public mind that there is one law for the rich and one for the poor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas will be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 685) to provide for the office of public defender for the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POPULAR ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am today introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to provide for the popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States. It is denied by no one that the country has changed considerably since the constitutional provision regarding the election of the President and Vice President was put into effect. It is only necessary to cite the facts that we now have direct election of United States Senators, that we have adopted woman suffrage, that in many States the initiative and referendum prevail, and that States' rights have largely disappeared—all parts of a general trend toward bringing the National Government closer to the people. I introduce this joint resolution in the belief that it is a matter of such importance that it ought to be presented to the people for such action as they desire in the framework of their Government.

I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and also that an explanatory statement to accompany it may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 33) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

The men who sat in Philadelphia during the long hot summer of 1787 were perplexed about many things, but there was one intricate problem which puzzled them especially. This was the problem of how to choose a President of the United States. The method

of choosing Senators and Representatives was a simpler matter, because the States were in existence; they were truly "going concerns." The central government, however, was still only on paper. It was a dream. Although the convention was composed for the most part of men of conservative views, there were many differences of opinion as to how the President should be chosen.

Some thought he should be chosen by the legislative branch. Mr. Gouverneur Morris, however, we read in the Record of the Federal Convention, "was pointedly against his being so chosen. He will be the mere creature of the legislature if appointed and impeachable by that body. He ought to be elected by the people at large, by the freeholders of the country. That difficulties attend this mode he admits. But they have been found superable in New York and in Connecticut and would, he believed, be found so in the case of an Executive for the United States. If the people should elect, they will never fail to prefer some man of distinguished character or services; some man, if he might so speak, of continental reputation. If the legislature elect, it will be the work of intrigue, of cabal, and of faction."

Mr. Madison held that "there are objections against every mode that has been, or perhaps can be, proposed. The election must be made either by some existing authority under the National or State Constitutions, or by some special authority derived from the people, or by the people themselves. The two existing authorities under the National Constitution would be the legislative and judiciary. The latter, he presumed, was out of the question; the former, in his judgment, liable to insuperable objections. Besides the general influence of that mode on the independence of the Executive: 1. The election of the Chief Magistrate would agitate and divide the legislature so much that the public interest would materially suffer by it. Public bodies are always apt to be thrown into contentions, but into more violent ones by such occasions than by any others. 2. The candidate would intrigue with the legislature, would derive his appointment from the predominant faction and be apt to render his administration subservient to its views. 3. The ministers of foreign powers would have and make use of the opportunity to mix their intrigues and influence with the election. Limited as the powers of the Executive are, it will be an object of great moment with the great rival powers of Europe who have American possessions, to have at the head of our Government a man attached to their respective politics and interests. No pains, nor perhaps expense, will be spared to gain from the legislature an appointment favorable to their wishes. Germany and Poland are witnesses of this danger. In the former the election of the head of the Empire, till it became in a manner hereditary, interested all Europe and was much influenced by foreign interference—in the latter, although the elective magistrate has very little real power, his election has at all times produced the most eager interference of foreign princes, and has, in fact, at length slid entirely into foreign hands.

"The option before us then lay between an appointment by electors chosen by the people and an immediate appointment by the people. He thought the former mode free from many of the objections which had been urged against it, and greatly preferable to an appointment by the National Legislature. As the electors would be chosen for the occasion would meet at once, and proceed immediately to an appointment, there would be very little opportunity for cabal or corruption. As a further precaution, it might be required that they should meet at some place distinct from the seat of government, and even that no person within a certain distance of the place at the time should be eligible. This mode, however, had been rejected so

recently and by so great a majority that it probably would not be proposed anew.

"The remaining mode was an election by the people, or rather by the qualified part of them, at large. With all its imperfections, he liked this best. He would not repeat either the general arguments for or the objections against this mode. He would only take notice of two difficulties which he admitted to have weight. The first arose from the disposition in the people to prefer a citizen of their own State, and the disadvantage this would throw on the smaller States. Great as this objection might be, he did not think it equal to such as lay against every other mode which had been proposed. He thought, too, that some expedient might be hit upon that would obviate it. The second difficulty arose from the disproportion of qualified voters in the Northern and Southern States, and the disadvantages which this mode would throw on the latter.

"The answer to this objection was: 1. That this disproportion would be continually decreasing under the influence of the republican laws introduced in the Southern States, and the more rapid increase of their population. 2. That local considerations must give way to the general interest. As an individual from the Southern States, he was willing to make the sacrifice."

Rufus King, speaking in the United States Senate on March 20, 1816, recalled that at the time of the adoption of the Constitution "the opinion had been that all undue agency or influence was entirely guarded against; that the men selected by the people from their own body would give their votes in such a manner so that no opportunity would be afforded for a combination, to change the freedom and popular character which naturally belonged to the electoral bodies. Such had been the idea of the Nation at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. 'We know,' said he, 'the course which this thing has taken.'"

"The election of a President of the United States is no longer that process which the Constitution contemplated. In conformity with the original view of the authors of that instrument, I would restore, as thoroughly as possible, the freedom of election to the people. * * * It was with the people the Constitution meant to place the election of the Chief Magistrate, that being the source least liable to be corrupt."

Others at the Convention who favored electing the President by popular vote were Benjamin Franklin and Charles Carroll.

The final result, of course, was the creation of the electoral college. The reason for it was given by Alexander Hamilton in the following language:

"It was equally desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements that were proper to govern their choice. A small number of persons elected by their fellow citizens from the general mass will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to so complicated an investigation."

This brings up a picture of a meeting of impartial people, each using his own judgment, to find the best man for President.

This is what Alexander Hamilton said that the electoral college was supposed to be. Actually it has never worked that way. The electors became automatons, exercising no discretion at all, and a whole set of defects came into existence which had been neither foreseen nor approved by the framers of the Constitution. At least eight defects in the system as it exists today are to be noted.

UNIT RULE

First is the unit rule, which runs roughshod over minorities. This rule makes a campaign in any State a gamble; it is all

or nothing. Even though Cleveland eked out a meager 1,149-vote victory in the great State of New York over Blaine in 1884, he received all the 36 electoral votes from that State. In no State where President Roosevelt received a majority is a single Willkie vote counted in the final reckoning. In no State where Willkie received a majority was a single Roosevelt vote counted in the final reckoning. Not only were they not counted, they were really misappropriated. In the final count the winner receives credit for millions of votes which were actually cast against him. On the basis of popular vote, Mr. Roosevelt should have been credited with 290 electoral votes and Mr. Willkie with 241. Actually the count stood: Roosevelt, 449; Willkie, 82. The extra 159 votes which the winner received came from the loser.

The unit vote, as Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA has pointed out, "was a method adopted by the dominating political party in each State to prevent the minority parties in the State from having any voice in the selection of the President. This effort of dominant political parties to prevent minorities in the State from having a voice in the selection of a President was intense preceding the election of 1800 and subsequently developed into a universal practice."

"The Tammany victory in New York in the spring of 1800 and the victory of the Jefferson party in Pennsylvania forecast the election of Jefferson unless the system of selecting Presidential electors should be changed."

"The Federal leaders sought to forestall the election of Jefferson by bringing about a deadlock in the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and thus prevent the people of Pennsylvania from having any voice in the election. They sought to change the system of selecting electors in New York from the general to the district system of election in order that Adams might secure part of the electoral votes of New York instead of Jefferson securing them all."

"The Legislature of New Hampshire took away the right of the people to select their Presidential electors and chose Federalist electors. In the election that followed the Jefferson State ticket won by a popular vote of 10 to 6, but the electors chosen by the legislature all voted for Adams."

"In Massachusetts the Federalist Legislature did away with the district system of selecting electors and caused them to be selected by general ticket to prevent Jefferson securing any of the electors."

"In Virginia the general assembly did away with the district system of election and provided for the general ticket system in order to eliminate the possibility of Adams securing any electoral votes in Virginia."

"In 1812, within about 1 week of election, the Legislature of New Jersey took away from the people the right to vote for Presidential electors, and selected the electors in order to prevent the opposition party from securing any electors from that State."

"Thus the origin of the unit-voting system was a deliberate purpose to deny all minorities a voice in the selection of a President."

One perversion of the original system led to another. Madison, for example, who had always opposed the unit vote, urged Virginia in 1800 to adopt it as a matter of defense against the opponents of Jefferson in other States.

It was also true that the people distrusted a delegate who was in no way bound. They were suspicious that a few delegates might, in a close contest, be in the position of dictating the choice. They turned to a system of pledged electors, and when that was done, as Mr. Lea says, "the reason for Presidential electors disappeared."

The result is that within a State a candidate gets all or nothing, and the voter's vote is counted on the winning side, whether he voted that way or not. He gets less than nothing.

The House report (No. 262, 73d Cong., 1st sess.) gives this compilation:

"For instance, in 1928, Mr. Hoover had less than 50 percent of the vote of the State of New York; Mr. Smith had nearly 47 percent. Yet Mr. Hoover received the whole 45 electoral votes of New York.

"In 1912 Wilson received 42 percent of the popular vote of the United States and 82 percent of the electoral vote. In 1924 Coolidge carried 12 States by minority votes, which gave him 86 electoral votes.

"In 1924 John W. Davis as candidate for President received 6,000,000 votes that brought him no electoral vote. Six million people went to the polls and cast a vote for Davis that did not mean a single vote in the electoral college. He carried a limited number of States in which he received less than 2,000,000 votes, and for those 2,000,000 votes he received 136 electoral votes. In other words, 6,000,000 votes meant no electoral votes; 2,000,000 votes meant 136 electoral votes.

"It is apparent there is no mathematical accuracy in the plan on a basis of inherent justice. In a close contest the result is subjected to chance, a turn of fortune. A large percent of the uncertainty is whether or not the plurality candidate will receive a larger percentage of the disfranchised votes than his opponent.

"In the election of 1928 the proportion of voters who were disfranchised in this way—that is, voters whose ballots were not only not counted as voted, but contrary to the way they voted—amounted to 38 percent of all the votes of the people of the United States. In other words, 38 people out of every hundred who voted had their votes thrown into the waste basket at the State line and they were not considered when the votes were counted at the joint session of Congress, where the result was finally determined.

"In the election of 1932 the votes of 39 out of every 100 people who voted were likewise discarded and not considered when the vote was computed here in the Capitol.

"In 1932 Hoover received 2,150,000 votes in States he carried, and which gave him 59 electoral votes. In the single State of New York Hoover received 1,938,000 votes, and not a single electoral vote. His votes in that one State almost equaled all of his votes in the States he carried, and yet from those States he received 59 votes and from New York nothing.

"Hoover's vote in New York, at the recent election, equaled his total vote in 23 other States in the Union. Hoover received nearly 15,800,000 votes and over 13,600,000 of those votes brought him no electoral vote whatever. All of his electoral votes came from the 2,000,000 and none from the 13,600,000.

"The total majority Hoover received in all States he carried was 230,585. If a majority of those votes in each State, 116,000 in all, could have been transferred to Roosevelt, the election would have been unanimous. Hoover would not have received a single electoral vote. Having received over 39 percent of all the votes, nevertheless, the election would have been unanimous. Hoover's name would not have been mentioned in the poll we heard over in the Capitol. As the votes were counted President Hoover's name was not mentioned in connection with the electoral votes represented by over 13,600,000 persons who voted for him.

"Mr. Hoover received only the electoral votes brought to him by the votes of 5.3 percent of the voters of the Nation who voted in the States he carried. He received no electoral votes from 34.2 percent of the voters of the Nation who voted for him in the States he did not carry. In other words, 34.2 percent of the votes of the Nation gave him no electoral votes and 5.3 percent gave him 59 electoral votes."

In the election of 1936, 35 people out of every 100 who voted had their votes disre-

garded when the electors gathered in Washington.

In the present election of 1940 the votes of 45 out of every 100 people who voted were, in effect, disfranchised. A system of computing election results that discards 45 percent of the voters before the final count begins cannot be said to be either just or accurate.

In 1940, in the State of Michigan, Roosevelt received 1,032,991 votes, which was a bare 6,926 votes less than Willkie received there. Yet he received not a single electoral vote, while Willkie gathered the State's 19 electoral votes. In Illinois, Roosevelt received 2,149,934 votes, and thereby secured all of that State's 29 electoral votes, even though Willkie received 2,047,240 votes.

In the State of New York, Willkie received only 224,440 less votes than did Mr. Roosevelt out of 6,279,396 votes cast for both these candidates. Nevertheless, Roosevelt received the entire New York electoral vote of 47, while Willkie received not a single electoral vote. As a matter of fact, Willkie's 3,027,478 votes almost equaled the 4,266,676 votes which he received in the States he carried; and yet from those States he received 82 electoral votes and from New York nothing.

WINS MOST VOTES AND LOSES

A second defect in the present system is that it makes possible a situation in which the candidate with the most popular votes receives the least electoral votes. This has actually happened three times in our history.

In 1824 Andrew Jackson secured a popular plurality of 50,000 votes over John Quincy Adams, but failed of the Presidency when the election was decided by the House of Representatives.

In 1876 Hayes became President by the majority of one electoral vote even though Tilden actually received 258,000 more votes than he did.

In 1888 Cleveland lost the Presidency even though he had a popular vote of 5,540,050 against Harrison's 5,444,337.

It is certainly quite probable that in future elections one candidate will receive the electoral vote and another the popular vote, and this is a contingency against which we should guard. The passions and hatreds that a bitter elective struggle engenders could well lead to violent and bloody conditions under such circumstances. This almost proved to be the case in 1876. Had Samuel J. Tilden taken a belligerent attitude, the United States might well have been plunged into civil strife. Fortunately, he refused to listen to the pleas of his followers to seize the Presidency by force. In the lands of our Latin-American neighbors violence flares because of far less provocative election disputes.

The attached table shows the difference between popular and electoral vote:

Comparison of percentage of popular to electoral votes

[Fractions ignored]

Year	Candidate	Popular vote	Electoral vote	Discrepancy
		Percent	Percent	Percent
1876	Hayes.....	47	50	3
1880	Garfield.....	48	57	9
1884	Cleveland.....	48	54	6
1888	Harrison.....	44	58	14
1892	Cleveland.....	46	62	16
1896	McKinley.....	50	60	10
1900do.....	50	65	15
1904	Roosevelt.....	56	70	14
1908	Taft.....	50	60	10
1912	Wilson.....	42	82	40
1916do.....	49	52	3
1920	Harding.....	60	76	16
1924	Coolidge.....	54	72	18
1928	Hoover.....	58	83	25
1932	Roosevelt.....	57	89	32
1936do.....	60	98	38
1940do.....	55	85	30

Average discrepancy, 17 elections, 18 percent.

DISCRIMINATION

A third defect is the discrimination between different classes of voters. The votes of those living in small States count for more than the votes of those residing in big States. Let us, for example, compare the smallest and the largest States in the Union. Nevada, for example, in 1936 had 1 electoral vote for each 14,616 popular votes cast in that State, while New York had 1 electoral vote for each 112,478 popular votes. Each Nevada voter, therefore, was equal to 8 New Yorkers in electing a President. The attached table shows how much more a vote in a small State counts than a vote of an equally worthy citizen in a large State.

The number of votes necessary in each State to equal 1 Nevada vote, 1940

Alabama.....	1.04
Arizona.....	2.40
Arkansas.....	.82
California.....	8.19
Colorado.....	4.49
Connecticut.....	5.64
Delaware.....	2.63
Florida.....	3.79
Georgia.....	1.35
Idaho.....	3.15
Illinois.....	8.32
Indiana.....	7.33
Iowa.....	6.28
Kansas.....	5.24
Kentucky.....	4.31
Louisiana.....	1.25
Maine.....	3.68
Maryland.....	4.70
Massachusetts.....	6.69
Michigan.....	6.26
Minnesota.....	6.39
Mississippi.....	.68
Missouri.....	6.97
Montana.....	2.63
Nebraska.....	4.94
Nevada.....	1.00
New Hampshire.....	3.41
New Jersey.....	7.12
New Mexico.....	3.54
New York.....	7.73
North Carolina.....	3.37
North Dakota.....	3.61
Ohio.....	7.35
Oklahoma.....	4.26
Oregon.....	5.12
Pennsylvania.....	6.51
Rhode Island.....	4.62
South Carolina.....	.64
South Dakota.....	3.96
Tennessee.....	2.49
Texas.....	2.41
Utah.....	3.56
Vermont.....	2.75
Virginia.....	1.82
Washington.....	4.29
West Virginia.....	6.10
Wisconsin.....	6.57
Wyoming.....	2.12

DEADLOCKS

A fourth defect is the method provided for breaking deadlocks. The Constitution provides that in such a case the election of the President shall be cast into the House of Representatives where he shall be elected by a majority vote of the Members—not voting as individual Members, however, but voting by States. It is, therefore, possible for 25 small States, with a total membership of only 89 out of a total of 435 Members to control the election.

USELESS

A fifth defect is the uselessness of the electors. They are not people who use their independent judgment. They are not nearly as well known to the voters as are the candidates for President and Vice President. The people need no go-between of this kind. It is, moreover, possible for a dangerous situation to arise in a close election where one or two electoral votes may have a decisive effect. The danger does not lie in the theoretical possibility that the delegate might forget his

pledge. It does lie in the possibility that he might be sick, or insane, or suddenly killed—or might meet with any of the uncontrollable mischances to which human flesh is heir. These risks are unavoidable for individual human beings; it is not necessary, however, to inject them into our system for electing a President.

ENCOURAGES FRAUD

A sixth defect, although an incidental one, in the present system is that it encourages fraud. By concentrating effort in a few doubtful States, the chance for corrupt electoral practices increases. The close New York State margin of 1,247 for Cleveland, to which reference has been made, for example, stood between him and 35 electoral votes. Thirty-five votes can mean the difference between victory or defeat. What a temptation for the boss and the machines. What a strategic place for them to stand.

ABUSE OF POWER

A seventh defect which is of minor importance is the theoretical possibility that the electors would abuse their power and disregard the Constitution. Those who set up dictatorships are often careful to preserve constitutional forms. This form serves no good purpose.

DISFRANCHISES NEGRO

The eighth defect is the tendency of the present system to disfranchise the Negro. Under a system in which no minority votes are counted, there is scant incentive to bring out the Negro vote. Under a system where all minority votes are counted there is reason to call forth a wider public participation in government, because even though a voter is in the minority in his own State, he may not be in a minority nationally.

These, then, are eight defects in our present system. They have been well summed up in the House report previously referred to, in the following paragraph:

"The only legitimate object of an election is to accomplish the will of the people. If we permit a system to prevail that thwarts that will, we trifle with one of the most serious purposes of the Government. Under our present method, now and then, that will of the people will be clearly thwarted. When that may happen, in the face of an intense inflamed public sentiment, we needlessly test the serenity and security of our Government. We plant hate, discord, and distrust where we could have Nation-wide concurrence in the good-will acceptance of the just verdict of the American people."

REFORM OF SYSTEM

Many attempts have been made to reform the system. Andrew Jackson was impressed with its defects. Agitation to change it rose strongly after the disputed election of 1876. In recent years Representative LEA, in collaboration with Senator NORRIS, has carried on an admirable campaign of public education and has produced a plan of his own which proposes to divide the State vote among the candidates in exact proportion to their popular vote. As he put it: "Abolish the electoral college; retain electoral votes; let the people vote directly; abolish the unit State vote and give each candidate the electoral votes of the State in exact proportion to his popular vote."

This plan is assuredly a big step forward. It eliminates the evil of unit voting and makes a deadlock unlikely, if not impossible. The only plan, however, which remedies all defects is that of electing the President by direct vote of the people.

That this is a far-reaching step which should not be undertaken without grave deliberation cannot be denied. But that it is a step which should be presented to the people for study, discussion, and perfection is equally true.

It has been too often and too lightly dismissed. Some of the things said against it

are not well founded. It is said, for instance, that the voters are qualified by State laws and that the decision on the question of who should vote is a decision for the States. It is even asserted that for the Federal Government to interest itself in the question of voting qualifications is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. Those who are impressed with this argument should read the Constitution, noting especially the way in which that document concerns itself with qualifications for voting, particularly in amendment XV.

It is said that the popular election of the President would give certain sections and certain parties undue influence. It is, of course, not our mission to help or hurt this party or that. It should be our task to render justice. I submit, however, that none can predict with any reasonable degree of accuracy that any party would suffer. The knowledge, for example, that all votes would be counted in the total would encourage voting by members of minority parties in States where they now do not bother to make a civic effort. They would know that their votes would matter. This would change the proportion of persons in those States going to the polls. But it would in the end damage neither party. Political parties have many other and closer opportunities for damaging themselves.

It is said that the popular election of the President would encourage fraud in the big cities. It may well be asked whether fraudulent electoral practices do not exist in many big cities today. It may be further set down that the present system, by unduly stressing the importance of certain States, gives a greater encouragement to the city machine.

Finally, the objection is made that election of a President by popular vote is an infringement of the rights of the States. That it does eliminate certain States' rights—many of which, let it be said, are largely matters of form—cannot be denied. We confront, however, the proposition that the only two elected officials to whom we can look to speak exclusively for the United States as a whole are the President and the Vice President. That the American people as a whole should have a prime concern and a decisive voice in how they are chosen seems both elementary and just.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 89) making an additional appropriation for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE IN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—ADDITIONAL COPIES (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 9,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 8, current session, entitled "Report of the Committee on Administrative Procedure, Appointed by the Attorney General, at the Request of the President, To Investigate the Need for Procedural Reform in Various Administrative Tribunals and To Suggest Improvement Therein," of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 4,500 copies for the use of the House, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and 1,500 copies for the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

PROTECTION OF GOVERNMENT RECORDS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be

printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. I desire to make a brief statement in connection with the resolution, if I do not thereby violate the pleasure of the leader of the majority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it is not a question of violating my pleasure; it is a question of observing the rules of the Senate. I shall not object at this time; I merely want it not to be regarded as a precedent.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure my remarks will not come under the definition of being extended.

Mr. President, during recent months in connection with our defense program catastrophes have occurred. Whether they are attributable to carelessness or sabotage or to the necessary margin we must allow for human error remains to be determined.

It would appear, however, that our administrative agencies should be moving rapidly toward a revised conception of the protection that is now required in view of recent revelations as to what has gone on abroad in the new technique of total war.

Meanwhile the Senate may prudently receive assurance that no action on our part is required in either legislation or appropriation to provide for the proper protection of the men and material essential to our defense.

I refer to the recent episode in the Civil Service Commission, to the disaster to the *Squalus*, to the explosion of dynamite on a tugboat at the mouth of Pearl Harbor, and to other wrecks which have occurred. Whether there is anything which the Senate or the Congress may do to assist the administrative agencies of the Government in providing more adequate protection, I think it would be well for us immediately to determine, for it must be a matter of very serious concern as we witness what has gone on abroad and what seems to be developing in our own country at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 62) was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that thousands of records of a highly confidential character concerned with our national defense have been taken from the Government files without any authority of law and for an improper use; and

Whereas it is evident that Government agencies everywhere must take greatly increased precautions to safeguard information concerned with our national security: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Civil Service Commission are hereby requested to furnish to the Senate at the earliest practicable date such information as may be compatible with the public interest as to the precautions now being taken to preserve the Government records within their respective jurisdictions from improper disclosure, and also to recommend to the Senate such legislation as they may deem desirable in the public interest to protect Government records during any emergency.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. VAN NUYS. I submit a resolution on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, and ask for its proper reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 63) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, hereby is authorized during the Seventy-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE KANSAS DAY CLUB

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Rekindling the Flame of the Kansas Cavalcade," delivered by him before the Kansas Day Club at their annual banquet in Topeka on January 29, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY HON. FRANK C. WALKER ON THE POSTAL SERVICE

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Hon. Frank C. Walker, Postmaster General, dealing with the United States Postal Service, published in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 20, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER ON WHICH FRONT SHALL WE MAN?

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article under the title "Which Front Shall We Man?" written by Richard L. Neuberger, and published in the Progressive of Madison, Wis., of January 18, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL FROM THE BIRMINGHAM NEWS ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the Birmingham News of January 18, 1941, entitled "Service for Americans," referring to the work of the Library of Congress which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUTH ABOUT DEFENSE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Truth About Defense," which appears in the Appendix.]

PLAN PROPOSED BY PHILLIP MURRAY FOR STRENGTHENING NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the plan for strengthening the national-defense program proposed by Phillip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations, together with a survey of the steel industry by Mr. Murray, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JUDICIARY—JOHN E. MILLER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message received this day from the President of the United States.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I nominate Hon. JOHN E. MILLER, of Arkansas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Arkansas, vice Hon. Heartsill Ragon, deceased. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee I should like to make a request which I feel is very appropriate concerning this nomination.

Senator MILLER has served with distinction on the Judiciary Committee for several years. I know of no man who is regarded with greater respect and affection than is Senator MILLER, the nominee. I feel that his retirement from the Senate, made necessary by his appointment to the judiciary, is a severe loss not only to the Judiciary Committee but to the Senate and to the country as a whole. I feel sure that he will serve with credit and distinction in his new position; and it is with much pleasure that I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this nomination.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the general rule which has guided the Judiciary Committee for many years, by which care has been exercised in the selection of nominees for United States judges, whether for the district courts or for the circuit courts of appeals, has a reason for its existence. That reason is that there is probably no office in our form of government that touches so intimately the life of the people of this great country. Therefore, whatever dignity may attach to other offices, there is no office more important than that of a judge of the United States district court, or of the circuit court of appeals, or of the many other tribunals which administer justice in this land. Consequently, the rule has been very carefully observed to examine into the character, the reputation, the experience, the special skill, and adaptability of the nominee for the peculiarly high character of service for which he is to be called upon in the event he is accepted for such an office.

When the reason for the rule is fully satisfied to the certain knowledge of every Member of the United States Senate, of course, it is a perfectly proper suggestion that the motion of study by the Judiciary Committee need not be performed, and an exception to the observance of the rule properly exists.

I know of no occasion when I could with more sincerity assent to following the exception rather than the rule than I find here. For many years we have

worked with Senator MILLER, before he came here, while he was in the House of Representatives, and since he became a Member of the Senate; and we know all that could be known through an investigation and study by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. What we know makes us regret the removal of this distinguished and able statesman from the United States Senate, but makes us willingly agree to his nomination to the bench, because we know he is a great lawyer, and he has the characteristics that will make a just judge.

Therefore I second the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I were to consult alone my selfish wishes I would oppose the confirmation of this nomination, in order that we might retain in the Senate the services of the nominee.

I believe I can say to Senator MILLER, soon to be a judge, that in the time he has occupied a seat in the Senate no man has earned or received from the Members of this body more universal respect, admiration, and I might say affection than has he. His transfer to the judiciary is a distinct loss to the Senate. I feel that if the Senator from Arkansas had remained in this body for a long period of years he would have become known over the country as one of the ablest, fairest, most sincere, and devoted men who ever served in this body.

I appreciate fully his desire to go on the bench. It is a great calling to be a Federal judge. It is necessary that the highest possible standards be maintained in our judicial system, because, after all, the people, even in the remote sections of our country, come into direct contact with the courts more frequently and more intimately than they do with the Senate or the House of Representatives or any of the Departments in Washington. The average man sitting in a courtroom, whether he has litigation or is a mere spectator, in large measure judges the efficiency and the justice of government by what he sees occur on the bench, at the bar, and in the jury panel. So, it is no less necessary that we have upright and honorable and able and fair judges than that we have upright and honorable and able and fair Senators, Members of the House, or other public officers.

Senator MILLER possesses a judicial mind. He weighs things from all angles, and he approaches problems with a keen determination to ascertain the facts before he acts. Much as we mourn his loss from our midst here, I congratulate the State of Arkansas and the Federal judiciary upon his transfer to that high judicial office. I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members of the Senate when I wish for him long and distinguished service on the bench, and, incidentally, that now and then our paths may converge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of JOHN E. MILLER, of Arkansas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the nomination is unanimously confirmed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Senator MILLER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD—OTTO S. BEYER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I send to the desk a favorable report from the Committee on Interstate Commerce on the nomination of Mr. Otto S. Beyer, of Virginia, for reappointment as a member of the National Mediation Board.

Mr. Beyer's term expires today. Unless his nomination is confirmed today he will go out of office tonight at midnight. He is engaged in some very important hearings in what is called the Southeastern case. His nomination has been before the committee for the past 2 weeks. No word of protest has been filed against it.

The committee this morning authorized a favorable report on the nomination. In view of the fact that unless it is confirmed today Mr. Beyer's term will expire tonight, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire about the action of the committee. Was the committee called into session this morning?

Mr. HILL. The committee was called into session this morning and a majority of the committee acted favorably on the nomination, although not all of a majority was present at the same time. For instance, I think the distinguished Senator from Vermont came to the committee room this morning and perhaps signed the report and then was not present when some of the other members of the committee gathered there, but a majority did approve the nomination.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the principal point I wish to develop is whether it is true—and I believe it to be true—that ample notice of the meeting, specifying that this nomination would be considered by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, was given to each member of the committee, and a number of the members came to the meeting, so that a quorum in numbers attended. Is that true?

Mr. HILL. That is true, although, as I have stated, a quorum of members was not present at one time; but a quorum did come to the committee meeting at half past 11 this morning, in response to a written notice which was sent to each member of the committee, and a quorum did approve the nomination.

Mr. AUSTIN. For how many years has this candidate served in the same office?

Mr. HILL. I cannot answer definitely, but this is a reappointment, and certainly, so far as I know, he has served at least one full term.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto S. Beyer to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be advised of the confirmation forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be advised forthwith.

CHARLES B. BRAUN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Appropriations the nomination of Charles B. Braun, of Louisiana, to be regional director, region VI, Work Projects Administration. Objection was raised to the nomination by a Senator representing one of the States in the list comprising that region, but that has been satisfactorily adjusted by a letter from Fred R. Rauch, Acting Commissioner, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1941.
The Honorable KENNETH McKELLAR,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Nominations
and Committee on Appropriations.

MY DEAR SENATOR McKELLAR: In accordance with the recommendation of the Senate Subcommittee on Nominations, Committee on Appropriations, made today, the State of Oklahoma will be detached from region VI (New Orleans) and attached to region IV (Chicago). This change will be effected as soon as the administrative details can be completed.

Sincerely yours,

FRED R. RAUCH,
Acting Commissioner.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination of Mr. Braun, as it is necessary to have his nomination confirmed at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles B. Braun to be regional director, region VI, Work Projects Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

HENRY RUSSELL AMORY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably the nomination of Mr. Henry Russell Amory, of California, to be Work Projects administrator for the State of California, to be effective February 1, 1941. I have conferred with both Senators from California, the senior Senator [Mr. JOHNSON] and the junior Senator [Mr. DOWNEY], and, upon their

recommendation, I ask for the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], I report favorably from the Committee on Commerce the nomination of Col. John R. D. Matheson, United States Army, retired, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, vice Maj. Henry C. Wolfe, Corps of Engineers, relieved. I ask unanimous consent that the report be considered at this time and that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nomination is confirmed.

THE COAST GUARD

Mr. BARKLEY. For the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations referred to are confirmed.

(For nominations in the Coast Guard confirmed today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. BARKLEY. For the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably the nominations of several employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the nominations referred to are confirmed.

(For nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey confirmed today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably, without amendment, Executive A (77th Cong., 1st sess.), the Inter-American Coffee Agreement, signed at Washington on November 28, 1940, by representatives of this Government and the governments of 14 other American republics, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dean G. Acheson to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 3, 1941, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1941, as follows:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Peter Woodbury, of New Hampshire, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, vice Hon. Scott Wilson, retired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. JOHN E. MILLER, of Arkansas, to be United States district judge for the western district of Arkansas, vice Hon. Heartsill Ragon, deceased.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Roberto H. Todd, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Hon. Harvey M. Hutchinson, retired.

REAPPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 37 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, AS AMENDED

GENERAL OFFICERS

To be brigadier general, Reserve

Brig. Gen. Richard Coke Marshall, Jr., Reserve, from February 4, 1941.

To be brigadier general, Inactive Reserve

Brig. Gen. Benedict Crowell, Inactive Reserve, from January 23, 1941.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 127A, NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT, AS AMENDED BY AN ACT OF CONGRESS APPROVED SEPTEMBER 9, 1940

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 29, 1941

Brig. Gen. Walter Evans Prosser, United States Army.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 30, 1941

Brig. Gen. Donald Cameron Cubbison, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Clarence Self Ridley, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. William Edgar Shedd, United States Army.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS WITH RANK FROM JANUARY 29, 1941

Col. Ralph McTyeire Pennell, Field Artillery.

Col. Donald Allister Robinson, Cavalry.

Col. Leroy Pierce Collins, Field Artillery.

Col. Jesse Cyrus Drain, Infantry.

Col. Marshall Guion Randol, Field Artillery.

Col. John Wesley Niesz Schulz, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Olin Harrington Longino, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. George Fleming Moore, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Donald Hilary Connolly, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Ralph Edward Haines, Coast Artillery Corps.

Col. Alvan Cullom Gillem, Jr., Infantry.

Col. Philip Bracken Fleming, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Charles Philip Hall, Infantry.

Col. Henry Terrell, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Russell Lamonte Maxwell (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Wade Hampton Haislip (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Harry James Malony (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Junius Wallace Jones (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Air Corps.

Lt. Col. Brehon Burke Somervell, Corps of Engineers.

Lt. Col. George Churchill Kenney, Air Corps.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1941, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JOHN E. MILLER to be United States district judge for the western district of Arkansas.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Charles B. Braun to be regional director, region VI, Work Projects Administration.

Henry Russell Amory to be Work Projects administrator for southern California, effective February 1, 1941.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Otto S. Beyer to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. John R. D. Matheson to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS

Sanders L. Christian

Paul M. Stewart

Roscoe R. Spencer

Walter C. Teufel

Royd R. Sayers

TO BE ASSISTANT SURGEONS

John G. Crawford

Clarence K. Aldrich

Evert A. Swenson

Vernon W. Foster

Robert D. Berkebile

Paul W. Lucas

Roy E. Wolfe

Lyman C. Burgess

Frederick K. Albrecht

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS

Mark D. Hollis

Frank E. DeMartini

TO BE ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS

Richard T. Page

Philip J. Coffey

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COMMANDER

Robert C. Jewell

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Chester McP. Anderson

Julius F. Jacot

Glenn E. Trester

TO BE CHIEF MACHINIST

Harold H. Wheeler

TO BE CHIEF CARPENTER

James E. Rivard

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Wilfred C. Brocklehurst

Philip A. Krugler

TO BE LIEUTENANT

John H. Wagline

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

John Carraway Bull to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy).

Leonard Carl Johnson to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy).

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Albert T. Humrichous, Georgetown.

Colla C. Saunders, Palos Park.

Emma E. Pugh, Plymouth.

OHIO

Herbert C. Glaser, Bellaire.

OREGON

Homer W. Egan, Brooks.

Mary Rebecca Osborne, Gilchrist.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. Wycislo, Catholic Charities, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thy name; we turn to Thee in humble prayer; hearken to our plea. In these days our troubled hearts await Thy grace; grant us the fullness of Thy benediction. Infinite God, steady our faith, strengthen our hope, guide our actions, for there is none other to whom we can turn save to Thee, our God.

Merciful God, our Saviour, make us worthy of Thine infinite love. Give us faith to keep this day in accordance with Thy holy will. And, lest we lose hope, remind us of our destiny: Peace is our heritage; the way to peace is through Thee. Dear God, bring peace to our hearts. Bless us with Thy charity, that we might be joined together in one common bond: love of God and love of our neighbor.

Holy Spirit, to whom all hearts are open, enlighten our understanding; make wise our judgments; inspire us with the light and strength of Thy grace, lest we fail to master the difficulties of these anxious hours. Refresh us from the fountain of truth and justice, so that, with strong purpose and clear sight, we might enter into the solution of the problems before us.